

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/792,304	03/03/2004		William Harvey Sproat		6260	
William H. Sp	7590 roat	08/20/2007		EXAMINER		
192 Ridgeviev	v Trail SE			MEHTA, MEGHA S		
Cartersville, G	A 30120			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1709		
				MAIL DATE .	DELIVERY MODE	
				08/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/792,304	SPROAT, WILLIAM HA	RVEY
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Megha Mehta	1709	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence address	;
A SHORTENED STAT.UTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC , cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communitiEANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	•	its is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> are subject to restriction and/or elements.			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawin	ince. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau*. See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application	

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claim 1, drawn to an apparatus used to sonic weld and form materials, is

Page 2

classified in class 228, subclass 1.1.

II. Claims 2-8, drawn to methods of using the apparatus to sonic weld and

form materials, are classified in class 228, subclass 110.1.

2. Inventions sonic welding and materials forming methods and sonic welding

apparatus are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct

if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and

materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to

practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)).

3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these

inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and

there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required

because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their

different classification;

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized

divergent subject matter;

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching

different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search

queries);

- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

Application/Control Number: 10/792,304

Art Unit: 1709

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Election of Species

- 4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:
 - a) the welding of metallic materials (claims 2-4)
 - b) the forming of nonmetallic materials (claims 5-6, 8)
 - c) the adhesion of both metallic and nonmetallic materials (claim 7)

The species are independent or distinct because nonmetallic materials forming is not obvious over metallic sonic welding. This results in a search burden for the examiner because the species will not be classified together.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/792,304

Art Unit: 1709

Rejoining practice

The examiner has required restriction between product (apparatus) and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on

Application/Control Number: 10/792,304

Art Unit: 1709

the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

- 1. No claim is allowed.
- 2. A restriction is required between apparatus and methods disclosed.
- 3. An election of species is requested between metallic, nonmetallic and combination of both.
- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Megha Mehta whose telephone number is 571-270-3598. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vickie Kim can be reached on 571-272-0579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1709

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSM